

# Catholic Candle

• October 2016 • [catholiccandle.neocities.org](http://catholiccandle.neocities.org) • [catholiccandle@gmail.com](mailto:catholiccandle@gmail.com)

## Uncompromising Priests offer Masses for your Dearly Departed Souls, throughout November

In their great generosity, uncompromising priests, a seminary and a monastery will gladly offer their Masses and prayers for your departed loved ones. These Masses and prayers will be offered every day throughout November, for the repose of these souls. No Mass stipend is necessary, although we heartily commend these holy priests, the monastery, and the seminary, to your prayers and generosity.

Participating priests and monasteries:

- Fr. Raphael, OSB, & San José Monastery, Ecuador
- Fr. Hewko, Fr. Pfeiffer & Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Seminary, Boston, Kentucky
- Fr. Pio Suneel, India

For your convenience and theirs, please send the names of your departed loved ones to [catholiccandle@gmail.com](mailto:catholiccandle@gmail.com). By our arrangement with these good priests, the monastery and seminary, we will collect the names and send all of them to *each* of these priests. The names of your dearly departed will be placed on their altars during the entire month of November.

May God shower these good priests with His choicest blessings!

**Catholic Candle note:** *As Faithful Catholics should know: we must be different from the world. If we imitate Our Lord, we will not “fit in” with the world.*  
(<https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-wants-fit-in.html>) Here is an application of this principle: we must not participate in pagan activities even “just for fun”. The following is a reminder first published in October 2016.

## Don't Celebrate Halloween!

Halloween is un-Catholic, which is why so many traditional Catholic priests have taught over the years, that Catholics should not observe this holiday.

Halloween, which the pagans call Samhein, is an ancient pagan feast still celebrated on October 31st, by witches and other pagans, and which pagans usually describe as being the most important feast of their (false) religions. See, e.g., “I’m Wiccan and This is What Halloween Means to Me” [<http://www.bustle.com/articles/7929-im-wiccan-and-this-is-what-halloween-means-to-me>] & witchway.net [<http://www.witchway.net/halloween.html>]

Besides the opposition “on its face”, between Catholicism and paganism, there are many other ways that Halloween is the opposite of Catholic:

- The vigil of All Saints Day is a day of penance: a traditional fast day. Halloween is the opposite: it is portrayed as a day of gorging, of candy and of eating in between meals (mortally sinful on a fast day).
- The Catholic Church takes witches, spells and demons very seriously and requires Her children to stay far away from them. Halloween is the opposite: it makes witches, spells and demons seem approachable, fun, familiar and harmless.
- The days which Catholics celebrate are about life and salvation. For example, Christmas is about our Lord’s birth in His humanity. Even Good Friday is about our Lord’s life-giving sacrifice on the Cross, out of love for us, to open the gates of heaven. (This life-giving sacrifice of love, which makes salvation possible, is why the Church calls this day *Good Friday*.) In complete contrast to Catholic celebrations, Halloween is largely about death and destruction.
- Catholicism takes death very seriously. The Church urges us to solemnly meditate on death and prepare for it. Many saints kept a skull in their bedrooms,

to ever remind them they were on earth to prepare for death. Halloween is the opposite: it is a time of smiling skeletons, tombstones with funny epitaphs, and a light-hearted treatment of death without any of its eternal consequences.

- Catholicism takes sin very seriously. The Church admonishes us to have a horror for sin and to consider it as the only true evil and unmitigated disaster. Halloween is the opposite: it is a light-hearted treatment of sin, *e.g.*, with costumed attackers randomly committing unprovoked mayhem, with lots of blood and gore, all without the consequences of reality.
- Catholicism values beauty and order. Halloween is the opposite. Halloween glorifies ugliness and disorder, *e.g.*, grotesque, painted-on scars “decorating” ugly and horrifying monsters.
- Catholicism values peace. Halloween is the opposite, exalting sudden and unprovoked violence, all without the consequences of reality.
- The Catholic Church forbids séances and all attempts to conjure the dead. Witches and other pagans believe that the feast of Samhein is when the boundary between the worlds of the living and dead is blurred, and when the ghosts of the dead can return to earth. *Id.* This pagan belief is honored by Halloween’s ubiquitous ghost decorations and costumes.
- The customary greeting of children seeking candy, is “trick or treat”. Think about this. However unthinkingly this phrase is uttered, it is in the form of a threat, *viz.*, if you don’t give me candy, I will do something you won’t like!
- Spiders are among the most common Halloween decorations. Spiders are prominent pagan symbols and are considered as guides in the occult. *See, e.g.*, [druidry.org \[http://www.druidry.org/library/animals/spiders-spiritual-guides\]](http://www.druidry.org/library/animals/spiders-spiritual-guides) & [whats-your-sign.com \[http://www.whats-your-sign.com/spider-symbol-meaning.html\]](http://www.whats-your-sign.com/spider-symbol-meaning.html)

All of the above considerations leave entirely aside Halloween’s worldliness, consumerism, immodest costumes, *etc.*

Because Halloween is in many ways the opposite of Catholic, it is no surprise that Halloween is ever-more popular, as society sinks ever-further from true Catholicism. See “Halloween is big business” [<http://source.southuniversity.edu/halloween-is-big-business-27678.aspx>] & “Ghoulishly good news for the Halloween economy” [<http://betweenthe numbers.net/2012/10/ghoulishly-good-news-for-the-halloween-economy/>]

Someone could reply that Halloween is “all just in fun” and is not meant to be serious. We reply: if a Catholic is willing to participate in un-Catholic things which are “all in fun”, where will he draw the line? If the practice of getting candy involved stamping on a crucifix “in fun”, would that be OK? How can we ever re-conquer society for Christ the King, if we take part in anti-Catholicism “in fun”?

So, what should a Catholic do? Do not take part in Halloween! Instead, celebrate All Saints Day even more than before! If there are “trick or treaters” where you live, we suggest you hang a sign on your door on Halloween, which says:

### **Dear Neighborhood Children:**

Our family is Roman Catholic and so does not observe the pagan festival of Halloween. Therefore, we do not give out candy today.

However, tomorrow (November 1st) is the great Feast of All Saints and we would be very glad to see you then and give you candy, if you wish to come. Please come between 1pm and 8pm.

No costume is necessary. However, if you decide to dress up as a saint, we will gladly be even more generous with candy, to reward your efforts.

Wishing you all the best!

Your neighbors,

[your name here]

## **What Type Are You? Do You Tolerate Liberalism or Resist It?**

The New-SSPX leaders promote liberalism and mislead the faithful.

Tragically, most people tolerate the not-so-subtle liberalism and foolishly trust the misguided leadership.

Yet, thankfully, there are still thinking Traditionalists who have that “special love” (see May 2016 *Catholic Candle*) for the Faith and its Founder and who refuse to tolerate any liberalism, no matter how small or how deceptively presented or promoted.

Let’s start by exposing just how fraudulent and deceptive the N-SSPX leadership is

(*i.e.*, Bishop Fellay). I’ll list just a few of their liberal positions:

- Dec. 20, 2012: The N-SSPX says that “Bishop Fellay has stated that the Society accepts 95% of Vatican II and its teachings.” [Whereas the texts of VC II are *completely* infested with error.]
- Dec. 18, 2012: The N-SSPX says that “there is no doubt that many Vatican II texts are traditional.” [Whereas the truth is that all 13 texts of VC II are *thoroughly* infested with error.]
- Dec. 10, 2012: The N-SSPX says that “Vatican II ... brought about ... the transformation ... in the Catholic religion.” [Obviously, nothing can transform the Catholic religion.]
- Dec. 10, 2012: The N-SSPX says that Vatican II is “most atypical, if only because of its desire to ‘open up to the world.’” [Minimizing the fact that it is most atypical because of the complete infestation of grave error in all of its documents.]
- Aug. 27, 2012: The N-SSPX says “When can we refuse something from the authority of the Church? ... Only when the Faith is in question...” [Obviously, this is false and we must refuse any command which would be a sin to obey, even if it is *not* a sin against the Faith.]

Compare the above with Archbishop Lefebvre’s saying: “It is, therefore, a **strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from this Conciliar Church** [*i.e.*, Vatican II], for as long as it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.” *Spiritual Journey*, ch.3 (emphasis added)

It should take only one of the above liberal points to disturb a thinking person, but any person who can overlook one, will manage to overlook them all. Have you noticed the leaders of the N-SSPX have not really tried to defend the above liberal positions? I think this is due to their arrogance towards the faithful; plus, how could they *really* defend the indefensible?

Let's review just the first and second of the N-SSPX liberal positions listed above. Bishop Fellay wants to make a deal with Modernist Rome and is willing to sell out his former Traditional principles to make that happen. I believe Rome dictates to the N-SSPX that they must accept VC II and all its errors in order to gain recognition. Why do I say that?

Because, otherwise, why mention anything about accepting any part of VC II since that could cause thinking laymen and priests to defect from the N-SSPX. But no, Rome insisted that Bishop Fellay accept 95% of the errors of Vatican II. If that weren't the case, he could have softened the blow by accepting...say, 10% of its teachings, hoping to avoid defections.

Rome also insisted that he agree that many of the texts are traditional. Rome wouldn't let Bishop Fellay try to slip a statement past the members of the N-SSPX that only a few of the texts are traditional. Undoubtedly, when the deal is made, Rome will control the N-SSPX, seeing how Bishop Fellay is so compliant in order to be recognized by Rome.

Now regarding the "tolerators", *i.e.*, those willing to tolerate the liberalism: Why do so many priests and faithful tolerate the misinformation and liberalism put out by Bishop Fellay and the "new" SSPX leadership? The Webster definition of *tolerance* might help us: "A relative capacity to endure or adapt physiologically to an unfavorable environmental factor."

I believe that they tolerate the liberalism mostly because they are afraid to look into and analyze the liberal poison that the N-SSPX flirts with and promotes. They fear what they will find. It might require them to do something they don't want to do—join the Resistance. So they choose to put out of their minds the punishment that awaits them at their personal judgment if they take the "path of least resistance."

The bottom line is they believe what they want to believe and what doesn't interfere with their comfortable *status quo*. Surely no excuse will positively affect the decision by the Eternal Judge. It's also likely that they are just too lazy to fight. They may also feel they don't want to go through the bother of trying to explain why they joined the Resistance. They would be embarrassed and their friends and family would criticize them. They should recall that St. Augustine teaches: "If one loves, one does not suffer, or if one does suffer, the very suffering is loved."

The tolerators have an ability to overlook liberalism creeping in, all around them. They fear daily that the leaders of the N-SSPX will make a careless mistake and fail to cover up their liberalism to such a point that the tolerators could not rationalize it and must take decisive action. Even *they* would not accept a new mass once a month in their parish. (And that's coming, for sure.)

Or, ... would they accept the new mass? It depends on how they use the graces given. They haven't used their graces well so far.

It also depends on how long they weaken their consciences in the N-SSPX environment of liberalism.

Thinking Traditionalists (those who have joined the Resistance), are a small group. But they have a soul-stirring and deep-felt burning love for the Catholic Faith and its Founder. They are fighters and will not tolerate liberalism to any degree. This type of love is referred to as "that special love," first mentioned in the May 2016 *Catholic Candle*.

This group is growing little by little but is under daily attack by the devil (as expected).

Because the Resistance lacks good leadership, they are an easy target for those who obstruct the Truth. The obvious, self-appointed leaders don't promote harmony and (even more importantly) don't promote the uncompromising cause of the Truth. They obstruct, sow discontent, and hinder our growth and success.

Let's continue our daily prayers for the poor blind N-SSPX leaders, and for all the weak tolerators, whose salvation is thus in jeopardy. Let us pray for the return of the "new" SSPX to the standards which Archbishop Lefebvre set for the "old" SSPX.

Lastly, of course, let us offer special prayers for the perseverance of Resistance Catholics—that they grow in number, strength and that "special love" for Christ!

## **We Must Pray for the Pope, Especially at Mass!**

*An examination of the erroneous arguments why we should not insert the pope's name in the Canon of the Mass*

It is our duty to pray for others. Holy Mass is an especially perfect time to do this, since it is the infinitely meritorious sacrifice of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Further, every pope has the frighteningly grave responsibility for the souls of everyone in the world, especially for Catholics. Thus, we should continually pray for the pope, and most especially, at Mass.

The devil knows the importance of praying for the pope and greatly fears this, especially the efficacious intercession for him at Mass. Satan knows that if God reforms the pope through prayers

offered for him, this reformed pope could spiritually transform (the human element of) the Church. Thus, the devil uses every lie and trick he has to discourage prayer for the pope, especially in the Canon of the Traditional Mass.

One trick the devil uses, is to make priests and people afraid to pray for the pope in the Canon of the Mass, fearing that somehow mentioning the pope’s name in the Canon causes us to affirm we agree with his errors. Some sedevacantists<sup>1</sup> and even a few non-sedevacantists have this fear, mistakenly arising (we can suppose) out of zeal for the Catholic Faith.<sup>2</sup>

For a priest not to pray for the pope during the Canon of the Mass is objectively a sin (since he is required to do so), even if no one ever knew the priest made this sinful omission.<sup>3</sup>

This objective sin is multiplied, if people *do* find out that the priest does not pray for the pope at Mass because this omission is an objective sin of scandal, since all priests (and all Catholics) have a solemn duty to pray for the hierarchy, especially the pope.

Also, this scandal is gravely multiplied, if anyone is led to conclude that the priest is a sedevacantist (because such priest—like the sedevacantists—does not pray for the pope).

### The Text of the Prayer for the Pope at the Beginning of the Canon of the Mass

Latin	English
<p>Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus ac petimus uti accepta habeas, et benedicas haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta <b>sacrificia illibata; in primis quae tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia</b> tua sancta catholica; quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum: <b>una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N., et Antistite nostro N. et omnibus orthodoxis, atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus.</b></p>	<p>Therefore, most gracious Father, we humbly beg of Thee and entreat Thee through Jesus Christ Thy Son, Our Lord. Hold acceptable and bless ☩ these gifts, these ☩ offerings, these ☩ holy and unspotted <b>oblations which, in the first place, we offer Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church.</b> Grant her peace and protection, unity and guidance throughout the world, <b>together with Thy servant [name], our Pope, and [name], our Bishop; and all Orthodox believers who cherish the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.</b></p>

<p><b>Memento, Domine, famulorum, famularumque tuarum N. et N. et omnium circumstantium, quorum tibi fides cognita est, et nota devotio, pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis pro se, suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis, et incolumitatis suae; tibi que reddunt vota sua aeterno Deo, vivo et vero.</b></p>	<p><b>Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaids, [name] and [name], and all here present, whose faith and devotion are known to Thee. On whose behalf we offer to Thee, or who themselves offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves, families and friends, for the good of their souls, for their hope of salvation and deliverance from all harm, and who offer their homage to Thee, eternal, living and true God.</b></p>
---	---

(Emphasis added.)

### Una cum Papa nostro Francisco

When we pray in the Canon of the Mass: “una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro, [name]”, this phrase is part of the same sentence in which we offer the oblation for the Church because *we offer this oblation for the Church and also (i.e., together) for the pope* (and the bishop, etc.).

Some people mistakenly think “together with” means that we declare we are together with the pope in whatever he teaches. In other words, this false argument asserts that putting the pope’s name in the Canon declares we are united (“together”) with the pope in whatever he believes. There are five reasons why this is false:

1. The pope is mentioned in the middle of a longer “list”. The prayer offers the oblation for the Church, then there is mention of the pope, then the bishop, then all Catholics and finally in the next prayer, we recall the people near and dear to us “on whose behalf we offer” this same oblation. This list has a clear order. We pray for the Church, then those governing the Church, then all members of the Church and lastly, those near and dear to us.

This grouping and the whole progression of thought shows that the reference to the pope and bishop is our prayer *for* them and is offering the oblation for them. It is unreasonable to understand this prayer as a declaration of solidarity: *viz.*, as if the prayer were to state that *we offer this oblation for the Church, then we declare we believe whatever the pope and others believe, and lastly we offer the oblation for those people dear to us.*

If we were to wrongly assume (as this false argument does) that we break up the series of persons for whom we offer up the oblation, in order to declare sameness in beliefs with the pope, why wouldn't we declare that we believe what the *Church* teaches, rather than only the pope? Whatever the Church teaches, we must always believe because it is always true. By contrast, we believe what the pope teaches only *when he teaches what the Church teaches*. (Any errors that the pope teaches are not the teaching of the Church.) Plainly, it is wrong to think this prayer of the Canon unites us to whatever the pope teaches.

The Canon is the perfect time to pray *for* the pope, when we mention him immediately after we pray *for* the Church. Because the Canon of the Mass is perfect, we would expect the perfection of the Canon to provide this (so this is a further reason to understand the prayer this way).

2. That the oblation is offered *for* all of these listed persons is further shown by this prayer (in the Canon) where it says the offering is made *for* the Church "*in the first place*", and then proceeds to mention the pope, bishop, all Catholics and lastly those near and dear to us. This prayer's phrase "in primis" (*i.e.*, "in the first place") shows that the offering will also then be made for others, the pope being the very next one listed.
3. That this reference to the pope (and bishop) is a prayer for him (rather than joining in his ideas), is shown by what the pope and bishops themselves say when they offer Mass. As the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia explains:

A diocesan bishop in saying Mass changes the form "et Antistite nostro N." into "et me indigno servo tuo" [*i.e.*, "and me thy unworthy servant"]. The pope naturally uses these words instead of "una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N.", and omits the clause about the bishop.<sup>4</sup>

In other words, the pope and bishop pray for themselves and offer the oblation for themselves. They plainly are not saying that they unite with themselves and believe whatever they themselves believe. As they pray for themselves in the Canon, likewise we pray for them in the same place, by inserting their names (and we are not declaring that we believe whatever they teach).

4. This fear to add the pope's name in the Canon ignores history. From the earliest days of the Church, the Canon of the Mass has included a prayer interceding for

the Church, the pope, the bishop and Catholics generally, as well as (in some earlier manuscripts) also intercession for the emperor and for the priest celebrating the Mass.<sup>5</sup> The prayer was worded in various ways but always had this same intercessory meaning. That same meaning continues in the wording of the traditional missal we use.

By contrast, throughout the history of the Mass, in all the various formulations of the prayers in early manuscripts, the Mass has never included a *declaration of solidarity in belief* with the pope, as is feared by those who fear to include the pope's name in the Canon.

5. The pre-Vatican II commentators unanimously explain this passage as a prayer (intercession) *for* the pope, not a declaration of united belief with the pope. Here is a small sample of such commentaries:

- The 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia: “The priest prays first for the Church, then for the pope and diocesan ordinary by name.”<sup>6</sup>
- *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*: “[We have] a special and express offering and prayer for the Pope and for the chief pastor of the diocese in which the holy Mass is celebrated. ... It is proper that, throughout the entire Church, the Pope should be prayed for and the Sacrifice be offered for him ...”.<sup>7</sup>
- *The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy*: “The Intercession (from “in primis”) ... begins by praying for the Church, Pope, bishop and the faithful.”<sup>8</sup>
- The commentator in the *St. Andrew Daily Missal* notes at the Canon's “in primis” that the priest “prays for the living heads and members of the Church Militant”.<sup>9</sup>

## Conclusion

For all five reasons, it is plain that we insert the pope's name in the Canon in order to pray for him (not to declare we believe whatever he believes). The pope is the only one on earth who can authoritatively reform the (human element of the) Church. Although we reject the pope's errors, we must pray for him unceasingly (especially at Mass), that he reverses his own course and lead souls back to the traditions of the Church.

### The Devil Uses a Second False Reason to Eliminate Prayers for the Pope at Mass

Some people do not pray for the pope at Mass although they plainly see that this prayer in the Canon is a prayer for the pope, not a declaration that we believe whatever he believes. They refuse to pray for the pope because they are troubled by the scruple that somehow it is a sin to pray for a bad pope in the Canon of the Mass because this prayer is the Church's *public* prayer, and people with this scruple suppose that it would be a scandal to pray for any bad man (including a bad pope) in the Church's *public* prayer. (These misguided people think it is fine to pray for a bad pope in *private* prayer, but not the Church's *public* prayer.)

But this scruple ignores Common Sense, Church history, and Ecclesiastic Tradition.

First, *common sense*: our prayers *for* anyone beg God's help for the person. Those prayers don't show the person is perfect but are asking God to change and perfect him. So it is the most natural thing for loyal sons of the Church to pray publicly for our bad leaders, especially at Mass.

Second, *Church history*: through many hundreds of years, it was the practice of good priests, bishops and laymen to publicly pray in the Canon of the Mass, for the emperor—not only for a good emperor but for *whoever* was the emperor, good or bad.

Third, *Ecclesiastical Tradition*: the prayers of Good Friday (going back almost 1800 years<sup>10</sup>) not only pray for the pope (for any pope, whether good or bad) but also *publicly* pray for the worst of men: heretics, Jews, and pagans, who are inherently bad in their stand against Our Lord and His Church.

It is plain that, however much evil the pope is doing, we should pray hard for him, including public prayers and especially at Mass. Let us unite in fervent prayer for the pope—especially at Mass—that God change his heart and enlighten his mind.

- 
1. Regarding the error of the sedevacantists, see: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html>

Although no sedevacantists pray for our pope at Mass (because they deny he is pope), even some sedevacantists correctly understand that putting the pope's name in the Canon is praying *for* him, not declaring that we believe whatever he teaches.

2. Any Traditional Catholics who have no contact with a person holding this tragic error, might be tempted to think the error is so “far-fetched” that a non-sedevacantist could never *really* think it was wrong to pray for the pope at Mass. However, there is a good non-sedevacantist priest, opposed to the “new” SSPX's liberalism but misled by this error. In our times of great confusion, he is (regrettably) not entirely alone holding this error.
3. We don't judge such a priest's interior, subjective culpability. See, *Catholic Candle* article against the sin of rash judgment: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-5>
4. 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, article *Canon of the Mass*, vol. 3, p.262.
5. See, e.g., *The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, by Adrian Fortescue, Longmans, Green & Co., London, © 1930, pp. 153 & 157 & Ch. III (entitled *The Origin of the Roman Mass*).
6. 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 3, article *Canon of the Mass*, p.262.
7. Rev. Dr. Nicholas Gehr, Herder, St. Louis, 1941, pp. 596-97.
8. *The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, by Adrian Fortescue, Longmans, Green & Co., London, © 1930, p.329 (parenthetical comment in original).
9. *The St. Andrew Daily Missal*, Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, O.S.B., Lohmann © 1945, p.972.
10. *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, Josef Jungmann, Benzinger Brothers, New York, 1955, English Edition, translator Francis Brunner C.S.S.R., Volume I pp. 481-2.

# Bishop Williamson's Position that the New Mass Gives Grace, Contradicts the Truth He Received from Archbishop Lefebvre

Bishop Williamson wrongly says that *the Council of Trent infallibly teaches that a valid new mass gives Grace*. Here are Bishop Williamson's recent words:

I'm sure you ask yourselves: "What kind of world are my children going to have to grow up in? **How are they going to keep the Faith?**" Very good question. By prayer and Charity and **by frequenting the sacraments**, so long as they are still available, **so long as it's at all still possible to reach the sacraments**. And some Novus—I've got into quite a lot of controversy for saying this, but it's true—there is no question that **some Novus Ordo Masses are valid**.<sup>1</sup> **And if they're valid, then it's defined by the Council of Trent that grace passes**, "ex opere operato", is the strict phrase.<sup>2</sup>

We showed in the July *Catholic Candle* that *the new mass never gives grace* and how Bishop Williamson falsifies the teaching of the Council of Trent.<sup>3</sup> Archbishop Lefebvre, also states the new mass does not give grace. Here are his words:

[T]he Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, desecrated as it is [*i.e.*, the new mass], *no longer confers grace* and no longer transmits it.

*Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, Ch.3.

Bishop Williamson was a great bishop and could be so again, in the future. Let us pray for this poor man who is spending his days promoting his own brand of liberalism which is not the teaching of the Church or Archbishop Lefebvre.

---

1. Bishop Williamson here assumes that some new masses are valid. This would automatically mean that the new mass has a valid Offertory, Consecration, and

Consumption of the Victim (Communion). For purposes of this article, we leave aside—but do not grant—his unsupported assumption.

His assumption is rash because the conciliar “offertory” is so radically different that it falsifies the Traditional Offertory and might properly be called an “anti-Offertory”. This is like former Pope Benedict XVI’s description of Vatican II as an “anti-Syllabus”, because it is the opposite of Traditional teachings (and falsifies those teachings).

Also, Bishop Williamson here implicitly makes the unsupported assumption that some conciliar ordinations and consecrations are known to be valid—which is a necessary assumption to support his supposition that some new masses are definitely valid. But the truth is that the validity of all conciliar “ordinations” and “consecrations” is inherently doubtful. For a thorough explanation of this, see these *Catholic Candle* analyses:

- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-ordination-doubtful.html>
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGd2RRcTFSY29EYzg/view>
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGZVF5cmFvMGdZM0U/view>
2. May 20, 2016 conference available here: <https://youtu.be/GGcr24n8fjo?t=22m> (emphasis added).
  3. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-mass-never-grace.html>

## **Bishop Williamson Broadens his Ecumenism. He Now Approves of Attending the Masses of Sedevacantists**

Recently, Bishop Williamson broadened his permissive liberalism by approving attendance at the Masses of sedevacantists. Before quoting his words on this, let’s step back a little and get the Big Picture on his position:

We start our analysis back when he taught a Truth that he now contradicts. On December 13, 2014, Bishop Williamson wrote that no one should ever attend the new mass. Here are his words:

Take for instance the **Novus Ordo Mass.** ... [I]t is as a whole *so bad that no priest should use it, nor Catholic attend it.* ... [I]f I say that *the new Mass must always be avoided, I am telling the truth* ....

*Eleison Comments #387* (emphasis added).

Further, in a conference on the new mass, Bishop Williamson correctly stated that even if the new mass were valid, no Catholic should ever attend it. Here are his words:

The new mass is in any case illicit. ... If it [the new mass] is valid, illicit, may I attend? No. **I may no more attend a valid, illicit [new] mass than I may attend a satanic mass.**<sup>1</sup>

But then on June 28, 2015, Bishop Williamson contradicted himself and publicly stated the opposite:

Do whatever you need to nourish your Faith. ... I would not say that every single person must stay away from every single novus ordo mass.<sup>2</sup>

Later, Bishop Williamson further explained his position that if a Catholic has no traditional Mass to attend, he should attend the new mass. Here are his words:

I'm sure you ask yourselves: "*What kind of world are my children going to have to grow up in? How are they going to keep the Faith?*" Very good question. By prayer and Charity and **by frequenting the sacraments**, so long as they are still available, **so long as it's at all still possible to reach the sacraments.** And some Novus—I've got into quite a lot of controversy for saying this, but it's true—there is no question that **some Novus Ordo Masses are valid.**<sup>3</sup> **And if they're valid, then it's defined by the Council of Trent that grace passes,** "ex opere operato", is the strict phrase.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, because the new mass is the principle liturgical expression of the new religion of the conciliar church,<sup>5</sup> Bishop Williamson is advocating the participation in the services of a new, false religion. *This is ecumenism!*

Archbishop Lefebvre called the new mass an example of ecumenical, interreligious worship (*i.e.*, “*communicatio in sacris*”). Here are his words:

*These new masses are not only incapable of fulfilling our Sunday obligation, but are such that we must apply to them the canonical rules which the Church customarily applies to *communicatio in sacris*, with Orthodox Churches and Protestant sects.*<sup>6</sup>

Because Bishop Williamson is so ecumenical as to recommend attendance at the conciliar religion’s new mass, it should not surprise anyone that Bishop Williamson is also ecumenical enough to offer Mass and confirmation in a chapel of the feeneyite sect<sup>7</sup> (which denies the consistent teaching of the Church that there is Baptism of Desire and Baptism of Blood).

Bishop Williamson has now continued further down the same ecumenical path. Having encouraged his followers to attend new masses and after he offers Mass in the chapel of the feeneyite sect, it should not surprise us that Bishop Williamson is ecumenical enough to have recently told Catholics to attend the Masses of the sedevacantists (who are inherently in schism, as discussed below). Here are his words, responding to a question at his September 25, 2016 conference in Texas:

**Question:** “I’ve heard some people ask one another, for example, “If there were no other priest available, would you go to a Mass offered by a sedevacantist [priest]?” Well, sedevacantists not believing there is a pope, I should think, would be pulling out the prayers for the Pope—out of the Missal—and just really not saying them.

Well, doesn’t it say in the *Quo Primum* that, basically, any omission from the official Missal of the Church is to be considered, I would say, an illicit Mass, so to say?”

**Bishop Williamson:** “Oh well, the Mass will be valid or not valid according to the Consecration. It’s not pulling out this word of that, that’s going to invalidate the Consecration.”

**Question:** “What I mean, though, is by changing the actual formula, would it affect whether or not you could say you fulfilled your Sunday obligation?”

**Bishop Williamson:** “Oh, no, I don’t think so. I don’t think so. You’ve got to do what you can. God doesn’t ask the impossible. He does ask the possible. The sedevacantist Mass is available. It’s close enough, and so— is it a devout priest? Is he a raving madman? Does he have the Faith? Sedevacantism is dangerous, **but if there’s no other Mass available, I wouldn’t exclude attending it.**

Maybe some people would take a harder line than that. If he’s a dogmatic sedevacantist and slants everything towards sedevacantism and insists that souls attend only the Masses of sedevacantists—beware! He’s beginning [sic!] to go too far. But not all sedevacantists go that far. So, you’ve got reasonable [sic!] sedevacantists and then you’ve got fanatical sedevacantists. **You might think twice before attending the Mass of a fanatical sedevacantist; but a reasonable sedevacantist, if necessary, I’d say one could attend.** It’s not this prayer missing or that prayer missing, it’s the whole push towards error which—towards clear error. So, no. A Mass which clearly pushes towards liberalism, like many novus ordo Masses, those you can’t attend.<sup>8</sup>

## Sedevacantism is Schism

By encouraging his followers to attend the Masses of sedevacantists, Bishop Williamson promotes attendance at the Masses of schismatics.

Schismatics are those who refuse to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff, and to be in communion with those members of the Church who acknowledge his supremacy. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.39, a.1, *respondeo*. That is exactly what sedevacantists do, *viz.*, they refuse to submit to the current pope, asserting that he has no authority over them because he is not “really” the pope.<sup>9</sup>

In contrast to the sedevacantists’ position, traditional Catholics have a duty to recognize that the current pope has authority over us. Even though we frequently cannot do what the pope commands us, we must acknowledge his supremacy, as St. Thomas teaches we must. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.39, a.1, *Respondeo*. We do what the pope commands us to do, whenever we can do so in good conscience.

Thus, *sedevacantism is always schism and sedevacantists are always schismatics*. Moreover, schism severs a man from the Church. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.39, a.1, ad 3 (quoting St. Jerome). A particular sedevacantist’s schism is “material schism”, if he is not interiorly culpable for his false and (objectively) sinful position that we have no pope. By contrast, a sedevacantist is a “formal schismatic”, if he is interiorly culpable (because he “knows better”).<sup>10</sup>

Because we must not be ecumenical (as Bishop Williamson encourages us to be), this is why Archbishop Lefebvre stated we cannot have any relations with the sedevacantists. Opposing what Bishop Williamson now encourages, here are Archbishop Lefebvre's words:

*So what is our attitude? It is clear that all those who are leaving us or who have left us for sedevacantism or because they want to be submitted to the present hierarchy of the Church all the while hoping to keep Tradition, we cannot have relations with them anymore. It is not possible. ...*

*[W]e really cannot make another choice if we want to keep Tradition. We must be free from compromise as much with regard to sedevacantists as with regard to those who absolutely want to be submitted to the ecclesiastical authority."*

Archbishop Lefebvre's conference in Flavigny, December 1988—quoted from *Fideliter* March/April 1989 (emphasis added).

## Conclusion

Whether Bishop Williamson calls a sedevacantist “reasonable” or “fanatical”, sedevacantism is always separation from the Catholic Church and is always schism (either material or formal). Thus, Bishop Williamson's approval of attending the Masses of those schismatics is a further extension of his ecumenism approving the attendance at the conciliar church's new mass and attending Mass in a feeneyite chapel.

- 
1. <https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=49s>  
<https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=2m38s>
  2. June 28, 2015 conference found at this link. [https://youtu.be/Ma9\\_10iVBik?t=1h1m](https://youtu.be/Ma9_10iVBik?t=1h1m)
  3. Bishop Williamson here assumes that some new masses are valid. This would automatically mean that the new mass has a valid Offertory, Consecration, and Consumption of the Victim (Communion). For purposes of this article, we leave aside—but do not grant—his unsupported assumption.

His assumption is rash because the conciliar “offertory” is so radically different that it falsifies the Traditional Offertory and might properly be called an “anti-Offertory”. This is like former Pope Benedict XVI’s description of Vatican II as an “anti-Syllabus”, because it is the opposite of Traditional teachings (and falsifies those teachings).

Also, Bishop Williamson here implicitly makes the unsupported assumption that some conciliar ordinations and consecrations are known to be valid—which is a necessary assumption to support his supposition that some new masses are definitely valid. But the truth is that the validity of all conciliar “ordinations” and “consecrations” is inherently doubtful. For a thorough explanation of this, see these Catholic Candle analyses:

- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-ordination-doubtful.html>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGd2RRcTFSY29EYzg/view>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGZVF5cmFvMGdZM0U/view>

4. May 20, 2016 conference available here: <https://youtu.be/GGcr24n8fjo?t=22m> (emphasis added).

For an explanation of how Bishop Williamson abuses the teaching of the Council of Trent here, see: <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-mass-never-grace.html>

5. That the conciliar church is new religion (with its own false worship), see the analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/is-there-conciliar-church.html>

Also, as everyone knows who has read Bishop Williamson’s writings for even a short time, the bishop has continually (and correctly) stated in the past, that the conciliar church is a new religion.

6. Archbishop Lefebvre’s November 8, 1979 conference, found at this link: [http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Apologia/Vol\\_two](http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Apologia/Vol_two)

/Chapter\_40.htm

7. Bishop Williamson's confirmation conference at the feeneyite chapel of Fr. Galvin Bitzer, is found at this link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ZlQ5BSgs9E>
8. Quoted from a conference in Houston, Texas, on September 25, 2016, found at this link: <https://youtu.be/Mn1jtS1VUGU?t=1h17m38s> (emphasis added).
9. We should not confuse the sin of schism (which is refusing submission to the authority of the *current* pope), with the sin of heresy, *e.g.*, rejecting as a matter of principle the authority possessed by the papal office (*e.g.*, that a pope is infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*).

Here is how St. Thomas explains this distinction:

Heresy and schism are distinguished in respect of those things to which each is opposed essentially and directly. For heresy is essentially opposed to faith, while schism is essentially opposed to the unity of ecclesiastical charity. Wherefore, just as faith and charity are different virtues, although whoever lacks faith lacks charity, so too schism and heresy are different vices, although whoever is a heretic is also a schismatic, but not conversely. This is what Jerome says in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians: "I consider the difference between schism and heresy to be that heresy holds false doctrine while schism severs a man from the Church."

*Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.39, a.1, ad 3.

10. For a more complete explanation of the schism of sedevacantism, see: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-5>

# Does Bishop Williamson Hold that a Person Should Attend a Satanic Mass if it Helps Him?

Previously, Bishop Williamson stated that we should not attend a valid new mass *any more than* we should attend a satanic mass. Here are his words:

The new mass is in any case illicit. ... If it [the new mass] is valid, illicit, may I attend? No. **I may no more attend a *valid, illicit* [new] mass than I may attend a satanic mass.**<sup>1</sup>

Now, Bishop Williamson teaches that a person *should* attend the new mass if it helps him. Here are the bishop's words:

*Do whatever* you need to nourish your Faith. ... I would not say that every single person must stay away from every single novus ordo mass.<sup>2</sup>

**Question for Bishop Williamson:** Since:

- you declared that a person should no more attend the new mass than a satanic mass; and
- you now hold a person *should* attend the new mass if it helps him;
- *do you hold that a person should attend a satanic mass if it helps him?*

Let us pray for poor Bishop Williamson! He is leading his unthinking and “obedient” followers to spiritual destruction! He has done much good in the past and he could still do much good if he comes back to Catholic Tradition!

- 
1. These words from Bishop Williamson are found at these links: <https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=49s>  
<https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=2m38s> (emphasis added).
  2. His words are in a June 28 2015 conference found at this link: [https://youtu.be/Ma9\\_10iVBik?t=1h1m](https://youtu.be/Ma9_10iVBik?t=1h1m) (emphasis added).